App. F. IX-4

1927. (Mysore)

File No. 385-27

Serial Nos. 1-4

Previous References

Misc 149-33-1-2

Later References

Misc 147-54-1-2

Misc-23-50-35-2

43-38(8-29

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for August 1928

SUBJECT

Recommends that certain S.Nos. in Jodi Bore village, Chiknaikanahalli ~~village~~ Taluq may be treated as Devadaya Inam lands for the benefit of the Sri Prasanna Rameswara devaru temple in Chiknaikanahalli Town.

G.O. No 489-92
dated 31.8.28

To the Mys. Com^r.
" Comptr.
" Rev. Com^r.
" Supdt. R.S. & Settlements.

The Mys Com^r's recommendation is approved

G. R. S. APP F.III—1] 1927.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 385
1927

FILE HEADING.

Confirmation of certain lands in Jodi Bommenahalli Village, Chiknaikanahalli Taluk as Devadaya inam to Sri Prasanna Ramanna ~~Devaru temple in chiknaikanahalli Dodr~~.

FROM

The Muzrai Comr.

No. 1501 Dated 27.6.1928. Received

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare copies	Serial No
1730	172e.	-	1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Recommends that certain S. Nos in the said village, may for reasons stated, be treated as Devadaya inam for the benefit of the mistry in question.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1

DD. Calling for a copy of the Inam Register, if submd. for appl.

30.6.28

2

30/6

NOTES—First Sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 385 of 1927-28

Serial No. 2

To. The Supdt, Rev Survey & Settlements
No 16. Dt 3.7.28
Calls for extn of inam
register pertaining
of lands in Q

3. From, the Supdt, Rev. Survey and Settlements, Letter no. 11 Dt 30.7.1928.
Submits an extract of the detailed inam register pertaining to the said lands.

3 The D.C's letter dated 7th Nov 1928 explains the facts of the case.

4 Godi Bommenahalli village in the Chikkanaikanahalli Taluk had been endowed as Devadaya inam to Sri Prasanna Rameswara Devara temple in Chikkanaikanahalli town for the Agama Service during Rajotsava. It is stated that one Ranjunda Shastri father of the present Agama Srinivasa Shastry, ~~seems to have~~ relinquished these inam lands in the year 1877-8, and since then they have been included in the Sirkar Khata, and so included in Majara Chikballapur. In view of the antiquity of the

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 385 of 1927.

Serial No.

meagre resources, both the D c and the m. c recommend that 11 S. nos noted by them which remain undisposed, may be treated as Devadaya inam for the benefit of the said institution. Submitted.

14. 8. 28.

mr Tuppar

b Nanjundaiah requisitioned the land proprietors accepting his liability to pay the jodi. The Agama Service is still required to be performed for the temple for which some cash remuneration is paid. The proposal to treat the S. nos referred to by the Collector as Devadaya may perhaps be considered favourably - in which case proper arrangements will have to be made by the inamdar undertaking to render of expenditure relating Agama Service to which the inam was originally granted. In case the [illegible]

5 AUG. 1928 No 1132

[illegible] received, it appears that the Khatah of the land should be in the name of the Mutt and not in the name of the Mutt Head. Please rectify accordingly.

WD 01714—GPE—30,000—1-4-28

General and Revenue Secretariat. Muz. File No. 385 of 1927.

Serial No. 9

The Muzrai Commissioner's recommendation is may be approved. The lands cannot, however, be treated as a Devadaya inam grant to the family which has now preferred a claim to them. Whatever was the position in the past, the lands have not been in the enjoyment of this family for about 50 years and there is ~~xxx~~ no good reason now to admit its ~~xxx~~ claim to them. The lands were intended for the benefit of the temple and they may therefore be treated as a Devadaya inam endowed to the temple and ~~its~~ the annual income derived from leasing them out under standing orders, utilised for the general purposes of the temple

28.7.28

10 D/F. G.O. submit.
21.8.28.

The preamble is to be amended in the manner indicated in the draft

11 A revised D/F. order is submitted as directed.
21/8/28.

13

4 To Muzrai Comr, Compt, Supt Rev Sur, DRev Comr No 6489-92 & 31.8.28 directs that the land be treated as Devadaya to the temple &c

NOTE.—Contn sheet

B

M. C. 13]

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
27 JUNE 1928
No. 18606

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore....25th June.....1928.

27

No. 1501 Jud Office
29-8

FROM

P. G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

28

Inam 385-27-1

To

P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

In submitting herewith the file of records received with the Tumkur District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.M.2661-27-28 dated - 7th May 1928 (copy of which is herein enclosed) in the matter of the treatment of the*marginally noted S.Nos.in Jodi Bommenahalli village in the Chiknaikanahalli Taluk which is a hamlet shown in the Inam -- Register, as devadaya Inam dedicated for Agamic service during ---- Rathotsava in the Sri Prasanna Rameswara Devaru in Chiknaikanahalli town and which during the Survey Settlement of 1874 was included in Majara Chikkahidare (a sircar --- village) as Devadaya, I have the honor to request that the S.Nos. referred to above at present Sircari and unoccupied may kindly be treated as Devadaya for reasons mentioned in the Deputy Commissioner's letter. A representation to this effect was also made to me when I visited the taluk and in view of the antiquity of the institution and its meagre resources I agree with the Deputy Commissioner's recommendation.

* 55,60,63,64,70,59,61,65,67,68 ()

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.M.2661-27-28 dated 7th May 1928 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"I have the honor to state that Jodi Bommenahalli village in Chiknaikanahalli Taluk had been endowed as Devadaya Inam to the -- temple of Sree Prasanna Rameswara Devaru in Chiknaikanahalli town for the Agamic service during Rathothsavam. But the name of this Jodi village not having appeared in the Survey Accounts a reference was made to the Superintendent of Survey and Inam Settlements who has stated that Bommenahalli-hamlet is shown in the Inam Register as Devadaya inam dedicated for Agamik service and that during the Survey Settlement of 1874 the village was included in Majara ------ Chikkabidare (a sirkar village). He further adds that S.Nos. which formed the Chikkabidare could not be made out from his office inam accounts, but they could be made out from the village accounts. From the subsequent enquiries made in the Taluk office, it is found that one Nanjunda Sastri, the father of the present Agamic --- Sivarama Sastri Seems to have relinquished these Devadayam Inam -- lands in the year 1877-78 and that since then they seem to have -- been included in the Sircar Khate (vide statement dated 23-4-1922 of Sivarama Sastri and the statement of the villagers dated 6-7-1927) Besides these, there is no other record to show when these Devadaya Inam lands were brought under Sirkar Khate, probably the statements seem to be true. Sivaramasastri's father has no right to --- relinquish Devadaya Inam lands.

2. The Amildar of Chiknaikanhalli Taluk, reports in his No.229/ 14-2-1928 that S.Nos.22,23,24,54,56,57,58,62,69 (Hidumoli) 55,60,63,64,70 kharab, 59,61, 65,66,67 and 68 of Chikkabidare village form the Bommehahalli village that out of the above survey Nos. nine lands viz.S.Nos. 22,23,24,54, 56,57,58,62 and 69 are in private holding, that S.Nos.55,60,63,64 & 70 are kharab and that S.Nos.59,61,65,66,67 and 68 are assessed waste lands. According to the final quit-rent register dated 26-2-1897 it is seen that the village had not been surveyed as the title-deed was issued before 1872 and that the old extent was dry 1-1-8 garden K.k.p. K.k.p. 0-17-8 with an assessment of Rs.136/- and that the name of the inam holder is "Chikanaikanahalli Prasanna Rameswara."

3. As it is clear from the Inam Superintendent's reference No.56 dated 28th August 1922 that Majara Jodi village Bommenahalli is included in Sirkar Chikkabidare village and as the Amildar reports that the

the survey numbers mentioned above formed the Jodi Dammenahalli --- village, I request that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained to treat the survey numbers referred to in the margin* which remains undisposed "as Devadayam".

*55,60,63,64,70,59,61,65,66,67,68

1. The file of records received with Gubbi Sub Division Officer's memo no.A.1-1454-28 dated 23rd February 1928 is herein enclosed for kind perusal and return."

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

RG

Letter No.M.2661-27-28 dated 7th May 1928 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"I have the honor to state that Jodi Bommenahalli village in Chiknaikanahalli Taluk had been endowed as Devadaya Inam to the -- temple of Sree Prasanna Rameswara Devaru in Chiknaikanahalli town for the Agamic service during Rathothsavam. But the name of this Jodi village not having appeared in the Survey Accounts a reference was made to the Superintendent of Survey and Inam Settlements who has stated that Bommenahalli-hamlet is shown in the inam Register as Devadaya inam dedicated for Agamik service and that during the Survey Settlement of 1874 the village was included in Majara ---- Chikkabidare (a sirkar village). He further adds that S.Nos. which formed the Chikkabidare could not be made out from his office inam accounts but they could be made out from the village accounts. From the subsequent enquiries made in the Taluk office, it is found that one Nanjunda Sastri, the father of the present Agamic --- Sivarama Sastri Seems to have relinquished these Devadayam Inam -- lands in the year 1877-78 and that since then they seem to have -- been included in the Sircar Khate (vide statement dated 23-4-1922 of Sivarama Sastri and the statement of the villagers dated 6-7-1927). Besides these, there is no other record to show when these Devadaya Inam lands were brought under Sirkar Khate; probably the statements seem to be true. Sivaramasastri's father has no right to --- relinquish Devadaya Inam lands.

2. The Amildar of Chiknaikanhalli Taluk, reports in his No.829/ 14-2-1928 that S.Nos.22,23,24,54,56,57,58,62,69 (Hidden o (i) 55,60,63,64,70 Kharab ,61, 65,66,67 and 68 of Chikkabidare village form the Bommehahalli village that out of the above survey Nos. nine lands viz.S.Nos. 22,23,24,54, 56,57,58,62 and 69 are in private holding, that S.Nos.55,60,63,64 & 70 are kharab and that S.Nos.59,61.65,66,67 and 68 are assessed waste lands. According to the final quit-rent register dated 26-2-1897 it is seen that the village had not been surveyed as the title-deed was issued before 1872 and that the old extent was dry 1-1-3 k.k.p. garden 0-17-8 k.k.p. with an assessment of Rs.136/- and that the name of the inam holder is "Chikanaikanahalli Prasanna Rameswara."

3. As it is clear from the inam Superintendent's reference ... dated 28th August 1922 that Majara Jodi village Bommenahalli ... ed in Sirkar Chikkabidare village and as the Amildar reports ...

the survey numbers mentioned above formed the Jodi Pommenahalli --- village, I request that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained to treat the survey numbers referred to in the margin* which remains undisposed "as Devadayam".

*55,60,63,64,70,59,61,65,66,67,68 ()

1. The file of records received with Gubbi Sub Division Officer's memo no.A.1-1454-28 dated 23rd February 1928 is herein enclosed for kind perusal and return

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

AG

A. P. F. VI. G1]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No. 285-27

Serial No. 2

No. 16

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To Supdt
The Inspr. of Survey
Rev. surveys

Date of issue 3-9-27

Sir,

I am directed to
Signed by L.K. Somasundaram Hy. request that you will be
so good as to send up for
reference, a copy of the
plan registered pertaining
to the grant under T.I.
detailed no. 6 of plan Land
in 196
in Godi Bommenahalli
Village, majhe of Chikka
Bidare, Huliyur Hobli
in the Chikkanaikanahalli
Taluk for the Superior
List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

over

WD0325—GPB—30 000—26 5-27

Devaraja Temple at Cherrakanaikanahalli
Town

I have the

No. 11

Enc one

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
31 JULY 1928

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
MYSORE REVENUE SURVEY,

Dated, Bangalore.....27th.....July.....192 8.

FROM

D. SRINIVASA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
Superintendent, Revenue Survey and
Settlements in Mysore.

To

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Financial Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

SIR,

As desired in your letter No.16/Mis.335-27-2 dated 3-7-1928, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Inam Register pertaining to grant of lands in Jodi Bommenhalli village to the temple of Sri Prasanna Rameshwara Devar at Chiknaikanhalli town.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

D. Srinivasa Rao

Superintendent.

LGR.

Register Sheet No. 19

Taluk - Budihal

village - Elikgidare

(Bommenahalli)

Register of Inams in the village of Chikkabidare

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant. Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
	As per Pymaish made by the Taluk authorities.			
12.	Devadaya Service.	Dry cultivation		63-90
		Bagayet —do—		8-27
		Dry Layak.		85-51
		Dry Nalayak		6-97
				164—65
	Old extent as per Chi drug by Comm's letter No. 783 dated 9 February 74 received with Nagar Division Comm's Circular No. 749 of 21-3-1874.			
		Dry	K.K.P 1-2-8	P.P.V R.A 2—0—0 5-13
		Bagayet	0-17-8	10—0—0 29-1
			2—0—0	12—0—0 34-14-7

Sammat of Muddenahalli in the Taluk of Late Budihal now Chikkanayikanahalli

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, *i. e.*, jodi, etc, amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
No assessment being given the account now calculated and charges Rs 136-0-0	—	For the Support of Agama Service in the Pagoda of Varadanna Rameswara Swami at Kusba, Chikkanayikanahalli The Service is said to be performed once a year.	Jodi P 12-0-0 or Rs 34-14-7.

The village has already been Surveyed in detail by the Survey Department, as a Sanket attached to Erikan Chikkabidare village

Vide Amil's Inam No. 1123 dated 27.8.74

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11
By His Late Highness in 1815	Copy (preserved in the accts) of the Takid by His Late Highness directing the Amil to continue (the coppalu) Kandy Dry in Murra Bommenahally to Ram Sastri and Ranjundia for Agama Service, to Pras Rameswaraswami at Chikk-rayi Kanahalli dated 1815. Mahasal chit by Amil directing the process of Bommenahalli Agrahar to be taken away Sitapa Sastri and Swaram Sastri dated 1837

E AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poorniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
To Prasanna Rameswara Swami	—	In the whole village Account of 1825. Besides, Jafty, Inam regranted under Huzur-orders in the mazra Bommena-halli to Adhya Sivarama Sastri & Ranjunda bhatta on a Jodi of P12-0
		Do account of 1830 Prasanna Rame-swara Swami Adathya Sivarama Sastri and Ranjuna bhatta. Kandy 1-0-0. in Mazra Bommena-halli on a Jodi of P12-0
X To account of 1833 from menahalli Uppalu Jodi Pagoda 12-0-0.		

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Chikkanayikana Palli Prasanna Rameswara Swami Agama Service Managers 1. Aradhya Nanjunda Sastri 2. " Chikka Nanjunda Sastri 3 " Sitaramaiah.	—	—	—

Boundaries.

East - A Stone 5 bondhs and adjigamudi Stone

South - Do - 3 bondhs and boundary of Chikkidare as far as the path leading to Kondakere

West - the boundary of Chikkidare, circa cocoanut garden Anjanmudi and boundary Stone.

North - Do of Kodihally a Anjanmudi & and 5 bondhs.

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam	Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19		20

Whole grant.

The parties in col. 15 claim the whole of this Mazra village on the ground that they are in enjoyment of it and they therefore contend that the Inam be recorded as a whole village on the ground that they are so enjoying it and that this circumstance is borne out by the Mahasool Chit quoted in col 11 and also by a Pattah (for the payment of the sale) granted by Mr Chalmers.

The Mahasul Chit is signed by the Amildar and as it was not issued after any due enquiry made into the ~~matter~~ nature of the Inam it is in my opinion no proof in favour of the claim. As for the Pattah it does not distinctly recognise the holding as a whole village. The heading of the Pattah is worded "Mazra Bommenahally" and at the same time alludes to the Huzur order quoted in col 11 which only entitles the Inamdars to one Kandy in the Mazra and not the whole of it.

The only circumstance in favour of the Raiyat is that the Inam is entered in the accounts of whole villages quoted in col 14 but these accounts preserve a copy of the Huzur order under which it was granted. The substance of the order is to the effect that

GPB—1 009 boo . . ieets each—9 5 06

one Kandy of dry land having been gr to the Inamdars' ancestors free of tax "Agama" Service they constructed a "Koppa or farm on the extent and planted then Cocoa and other trees: that the Inam after wards been Inducted it was negatived on the Existing Jodi on the representation of Inamdars that they have no other means of livelihood and in consideration of the Devadayam Service they have to perform and their past trouble to build the Koppala and plant the garden.

From the above it is evident that the Inamdar properly Speaking is to only one Kandy of land, but as it is generally the case, he appears to have been enjoying prescriptively about 11 times as much more. I think it would be hard upon the Inamdar to allow him only the extent mentioned in the account in Such cases. I would therefore Submit the case for the Consideration of the Inam Commissioner.

The Inam has however been measured through the Taluk authorities and the Pymaish putty is herewith Submitted, from which it would appear that Banjar lands Nos 6 7 8 & 9 measuring 97.25 were pointed out by the Inamdar as belonging to him, while the Survey Department have measured and numbered them as Sirkar This extent is therefore left out and the rest entered in col 5.

To be Confirmed on the existing Jodi Rs 34-14-7 So long as the object of the grant is duly fulfilled.

(Sd) Syed Nasaruddin
Offg. Asstt

30 June 71.

Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner.

20

From the penultimate para of the preceding column, it is presumed that the Survey have treated the extent in col. 4 as Inam after classifying as Sirkar Lands the fields Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 measuring in extent 97 25 acre as per Amildar's Pymaish made in Decr. 1869.

I do not think that this circumstance alone is sufficient to treat the large extent of 164. 65 acres as Inam when the Inamdar was credited in the jamy account with one Kandy of land in Bommenahalli a hamlet attached to this village.

If information is forthcoming it should be stated that when the Inam was resumed and restored by H.H. the late Maharaja whether the extent to which the Inamdar lays claim, was attached and released or only the portion under cultivation.

The remark made in English in col. 14 as expected from the accounts of whole villages prepared in 1825 is unintelligible and seems to be incomplete.

If it signifies that in addition to the restoration of the attached inam of 1 Kandi on a Jodi of Rs 12-0-0, the remaining..

portion of Bommenahalli was alone Con-veyed, the Inamdars claim to the whole of it is, I Consider, Sustainable. The Said account and the document quoted in Col: 11 Should be, Submitted for perusal.

9.7.71. (Sd) B. Gopalaiah

In reply to the foregoing requisition from the Amildar, he States in his Lr.no. 219 of 15th August 1871 that the whole of the Land mentioned in col: 4 has been in the enjoyment of the parties in col: 15 for a long time, and that the Ryots and Shanbhogues of the adjoining villages admit the Correctness of the boundaries. However the amildar has given no reply to my questions whether, when the Inam was resumed and restored, the whole of the hamlet or only a portion of it were mentioned in the list Submitted on those occasions.

I presume this information Can-not be had. The papers noted in col: 11 & as forwarded by the Amildar mention this hamlet as an agrahar I am in-clined to recommend the extent in col: 4 to be confirmed as an Inam giving the benefit of the doubt to the Inamdar on a Jodi of Rs 34-15-0 So long as the object of the grant is fulfilled. The Amildars Lr.no is herewith Submitted.

(Sd) B. G.

29.9.71

I concur with the Special Assistant[17] in his review. Confirmed on the jodi of Rs 34-15. Subject to all Local Funds and Irrigation Abkari and Sayer, if any, reserved as also the right to Sandal & Teak.

(Sd) R. A. Cole
17.10.71. Supdt of Inam Sets

The account and T.D Departments ask whether this (Case 12) should be treated as a whole village. The answer is in the affirmative, vide the Spl. Asstt's review, which was approved by the Inam Commr. the name of the village is Bommenahalli and the boundaries given in the Statement and corroborated in the Amil's Enquiry should be entered in T.D & on the Register.

25.10.72 (Sd) R.N.N.

yes, but show me the Takeeds alluded to in col: 11. was ~~sent~] rent to Govt ever ~~was~~ paid on the excess of 164 acres?

(Sd) R A Cole

29.10.72

× order prepared to Amil.

Seen

(Sd) R A. Cole

10.12.72

In his arzi no. 688 of the 11 January 1873 the Amil reports that there are no Dakalas in his record to show that rent was ever paid to Govt on the excess of 164 acres

Submitted

27.1.73.

The village is entered as such in the whole village account of 1825 and should be treated as such. The 164 acres must be allowed as long as they are within the recognised boundaries

(Intd) R. A. Cole
27.1.73. Superintendent.

Compared
LH
28.7.73

"Copy"
C Drinkwater
for Superintendent

G.R.S. App. F VI G-2]

SUBJECT..... (a typed D.O. will be kept on the file after appl.)

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

General and revenue Secretariat

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

( )

the *192* .

Date of issue 31/8/28

Signed by Mr L K Ameshwara Gupta

Read—

Letter no 1501 dt 27 June 1928 from the Asst. Comr in Mysore submitting proposals in the matter of the Inam lands originally intended for Agama Service in the Sri Prasanna Rameswara Devasthana Temple in Chiknaikanahalli town

Order Thereon No.

Consider

Jodi Bommenahalli Village in the Chikkanaikanhalli Taluk had been granted as Devadaya

May this be

i Printed ? ✓

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Same me file.

to Sri Prasanna Ramemara
Devara temple in Chikkanaikna-
halli town for Agama
Service during Kalo-bana.
It is reported that one
Ranjunda Shastry father
of the present Agamik
Sivacama Shastry relinquished
the inam lands in the year
1877-8 and since then
they have been included
in the Sirkar khata,
and included in majra
Chikka bidare Village-
The D.C. reports that
a representation was made
to him when he visited the
Taluq and recommends that
in view of the antiquity of the
institn and its meagre re-
sources, the S.Nos. mentioned
indicated which are Sirkari
at present and unoccupied
may be treated as Devadaya

List of enclosure.

(55, 60, 63, 64, 70)
(59, 61, 65, 66, 67
& 68).

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0326—GPB—12,500—26-5 27

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

for the benefit of the temple.

(2) Copy the member's minutes in para 8 of the office note from the Min's recommendation ... to temple"

D(J) Addl Secy

Print

Min Affairs Secy

Mr Rao, Comm

" Chandra

" Mr. Rama

Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

G. O. No. 489-92—Muz, 385-27-4, dated 27th—31st August 1928

Sri Prasanna Rameswaradevaru Temple

States that the Inam lands originally intended for Agama Service in the —— in Chiknayakanhalli may be treated as a Devadaya Inam endowed to the temple.

READ—

Letter No. 1501, dated 27th June 1928, from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, submitting proposals in the matter of the Inam lands originally intended for Agama Service in the Sri Prasanna Rameswaradevaru Temple in Chiknayakanhalli Town.

ORDER No. 489-92—MUZ. 385-27-4, DATED 27TH—31ST AUGUST 1928.

Jodi Bommenahalli village in the Chiknayakanhalli Taluk has been endowed as Devadaya Inam to Sri Prasanna Rameswaradevaru Temple in Chiknayakanhalli Town for Agama Service during Ratotsava. It is reported that one Nanjunda Sastry, father of the present Agamik Sivarama Sastry relinquished the Inam lands in the year 1877-78 and since then they have been included in the Sirkar Khate and included in Majra Chikkabidare village The Muzrai Commissioner reports that a representation was made to him when he visited the taluk and recommends that in view of the antiquity of the institution and its meagre resources, the Survey numbers marginally indicated which are Sirkari at present and unoccupied, may be treated as Devadaya for the benefit of the temple.

(55, 60, 63, 64, 70) (Kharab) (59, 61, 65, 66, 67 and 68)

2. The Muzrai Commissioner's recommendation is approved. The lands connot, however, be treated as a Devadaya Inam grant to the family which has now preferred a claim to them. Whatever was the position in the past, the lands have not been in the enjoyment of this family for about 50 years and there is no good reason now to admit its claim to them. The lands were intended for the benefit of the temple and they may therefore be treated as a Devadaya Inam endowed to the temple and the annual income derived from leasing them out under standing orders, utilised for the general purposes of the temple.

For Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

To—The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore
The Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.
The Superintendent, Revenue Survey and Settlements

Exd.—P S R N.